Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include revisions to FIG. 1A through FIG. 1D, each of which has been revised to add the legend –PRIOR ART— as required by the Examiner.

Attachment: Replacement sheet 1
Annotated Sheet 1 showing the revisions.

REMARKS

The drawings for the above-identified application were objected to in the Office Action mailed May 17, 2005 because the legend – Prior Art – was missing from FIGS. 1A-1D. Corrections to these figures are shown on the attached copies.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were allowed. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Applicants Admitted Prior Art shown in FIGS. 1A-1D. Claim 4 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the Applicants Admitted Prior Art.

The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to FIG. 4, which is an enlarged view of an exemplary embodiment of a via terminal recited in claim 4. As shown in FIG. 4 and as described in paragraph [0049] the front surface side conductive part 24a is connected to the rear surface side conductive part 24b at position "P" within the via hold 180, which is within the thickness of the core substrate.

In the prior art, these conductive parts are connected on the rear surface of the core substrate. By constructing the parts as shown in FIG. 4, which depicts an embodiment of the invention claimed in claim 4, the invention claimed in claim 4 not only has a different structure but it provides a more reliable connection than is possible using the prior art connection.

In light of the corrections to the drawings and the argument set forth above, the Applicant respectfully requests that the application, including claim 4, be allowed to issue forthwith.

Respectfully submitted

oseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578

Ladas & Parry

224 South Michigan Avenue

Chicago, Illinois 60604

(312) 427-1300



Appl. No. 10/776,864 Amdt. Dated Aug. 11, 2005 Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005 Replacement Sheet

